tincl thing from the soul, is to multiply entities without necessity. The soul endued with a plastic power, the chief formatrixof its own body, the contribution of certain other causes not excluded* 23. That besides that plastic principle in particular animals, forming them as so many little worlds, there is a general plastic nature in the whole corporeal universe, which likewise, according to Aristotle, is either a part and lower power of a conscious mundane soul, or else something depending on it 24. That no less according to Aristotle than Plato and Socrates, ourselves partake of life from the life, of the universe, as well as we do of heat and cold, from the heat and cold of the universe; from whence it appears, that Aristotle also held the world's animation, with further undeniable proof thereof. An answer to two the most considerable places of that philosopher, that seem to imply the contrary. That Aristotle's first immoveable mover was no soul, but a perfect intellect abstract from matter; but that he supposed this to move only as a final cause, or as being loved, and besides it, a mundane soul and plastic nature^ to move the heavens efficiently. Neither Aristotle's nature, nor his mundane soul, the supreme Deity. However, though there be no such mundane soul, as both Plato and Aristotle conceived, yet notwithstanding there may be a plastic nature depending upon a higher intellectual principle. 25. No impossibility of some other particular plastic principles; and though it be not reasonable to think, that every plant, herb, and pile of grass, hath a plastic or vegetative soul of its own, nor that the earth is an animal; yet, that there may possibly be one plas-